



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,006	09/28/2001	David J. Lineman	12225.0035.NPUS00	4813
20792	7590	07/01/2008	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
PO BOX 37428			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RALEIGH, NC 27627			2131	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

3

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS

5 AND INTERFERENCES

6

7

8 *Ex parte* DAVID J. LINEMAN and SCOTT R. WIERSCHEM

9

10

11 Appeal 2007-3773

12 Application 09/966,006¹

13 Technology Center 2100

14

15

16 Decided: June 30, 2008

17

18

19

20 Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, ALLEN R. MACDONALD, and

21 CAROLYN D. THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

22

23 THOMAS, C., *Administrative Patent Judge*.

24

25 DECISION ON APPEAL

26 I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

27 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final rejection

28 of claims 1-56 mailed December 13, 2005. We have jurisdiction under

29 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

¹ Application filed September 28, 2001. The real party in interest is NetIQ Corporation.

1 We affirm.

2

A. INVENTION

4 Appellants invented a software program capable of creating and
5 managing security policies on a network. When a computer administrator
6 selects a set of security controls based on the selected policy, it
7 automatically communicates the controls to computer systems in the
8 network capable of understanding this information. The invention further
9 communicates this policy to individuals responsible for understanding the
10 policy via a software program and tracks their reading and understanding of
11 the policy via the same software. (Spec., Abstract.)

12

B. ILLUSTRATIVE CLAIMS

14 The appeal contains claims 1-56. Claims 1, 11, 26, and 51 are
15 independent claims. Claims 1, 11, and 26 are illustrative:

16 1. A method for managing a security policy for one or more
17 users in a network, comprising:

c) enabling the one or more users on the network to view the security policy document using the plurality of data elements for communicating the security policy to the one or more users included in the security policy document; and

d) receiving electronic data relevant to user viewing of the security policy document using the policy management program.

11. A method for managing a security policy for one or more first computers in a network, comprising:

a) running a software program on a second computer in communication with the network;

b) enabling creation of a security policy document using the software program by enabling selection of security policies from a set of opinions; and

- c) automatically configuring the security policy document to provide one or more technical controls for implementing the security policy on at least one first computer.

26. A method for managing a security policy for one or more users and one or more first computers in a network, comprising:

a) running a software program on a second computer in communication with the network:

b) creating a security policy document using the software program; and

c) automatically configuring the security policy document to create (i) a human-readable security policy document and (ii) a machine-readable security policy document containing technical controls readable by at least one first computer.

Appeal 2007-3773
Application 09/966,006

C. REFERENCE

2 The single reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the
3 claims on appeal is:

D. REJECTION

8 The Examiner entered the following rejection which is before us for
9 review:

10 Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being
11 anticipated by Jacobson.

II. PROSECUTION HISTORY

14 Appellants appealed from the Final Rejection and filed an Appeal
15 Brief (App. Br.) on July 11, 2006. The Examiner mailed an Examiner's
16 Answer (Ans.) on October 19, 2006. Appellants filed a Reply Brief (Reply
17 Br.) on November 24, 2006.

III. ISSUES

20 Whether Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting
21 claims 1-56 as being anticipated by Jacobson.

IV. FINDINGS OF FACT

2 The following findings of fact (FF) are supported by a preponderance
3 of the evidence.

Claim Construction

5 1. The Specification discloses that “the security policy document is
6 represented using a structured data representation technique known as
7 Extensible Markup Language (XML). However, other markup languages,
8 such as . . . object languages, . . . or other portable representation languages
9 may also be used.” (Spec., ¶[0040].)

Jacobson

2. Jacobson discloses:

The method provides the steps of electronically monitoring network user compliance with a network security policy stored in a database, electronically evaluating network security policy compliance based on network user compliance, and electronically undertaking a network policy compliance action in response to network security policy compliance.

(Abstract.)

20 3. Jacobson discloses a “need for network communications software
21 programs that offers robust policy compliance assistance, policy
22 effectiveness monitoring and reporting.” (Col. 1, ll. 61-63.)

23 4. Jacobson discloses that “[t]he network policy compliance actions
24 may include electronically implementing a different network security policy
25 selected from network security policies stored in the database, generating

1 policy effectiveness reports, and providing a retraining module to network
2 users.” (Col. 2, ll. 15-19.)

3 5. Jacobson discloses that the “network policies are generated by
4 guidelines created from employee feedback obtained during a training
5 session.” (Col. 5, ll. 48-50.)

6 6. Jacobson discloses that the “policy training module 105 uses the
7 user’s policy recommendations as a benchmark for other users to use during
8 policy creation/training sessions.” (Col. 6, ll. 23-26.)

9 7. Jacobson discloses that “policy effectiveness system 100 includes a
10 policy resource 145 database . . . Materials included in the policy resource
11 database 145 include . . . a policy manual.” (Col. 18, ll. 52-59.)

12 8. Jacobson discloses that “[t]he policy effectiveness system 100
13 includes an object library/object level licensing system . . .” (Col. 20, ll. 24-
14 26.)

15 9. Jacobson discloses that “[a]ll software is distributed with
16 compliance conditions or restrictions of its use . . .” (Col. 19, ll. 60-63).

17 10. Jacobson discloses that “new policy(s) are automatically added to
18 the policy effectiveness system and the organization’s policy manual.” (Col.
19 19, ll. 14-16).

20

21 V. PRINCIPLES OF LAW

22 “[A]nticipation of a claim under § 102 can be found only if the prior
23 art reference discloses every element of the claim . . .” *In re King*, 801

1 F.2d 1324, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (citing *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik*
2 *GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir.
3 1984)). "[A]bsence from the reference of any claimed element negates
4 anticipation." *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565, 1571
5 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

6 "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in
7 the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior
8 art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d
9 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Analysis of whether a claim is patentable over
10 the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 begins with a determination of the scope
11 of the claim. We determine the scope of the claims in patent applications
12 not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their
13 broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification as it would be
14 interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech.*
15 *Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The properly interpreted claim
16 must then be compared with the prior art.

17

18 VI. ANALYSIS

19 *Grouping of Claims*

20 Group I: In the Brief, Appellants argue claims 1-10 and 52 as a
21 group (App. Br. 4-6). In other words, for claims 2-10, and 52, Appellants
22 merely repeat the same argument made for claim 1. Thus, the Board selects

1 representative claim 1 to decide the appeal for this group. Accordingly, the
2 remaining claims in this group stand or fall with claim 1.

3 Group II: Appellants argue claims 11-15, 17, and 20-25 as a group
4 (App. Br. 6-7). For claims 12-15 and 21-25, Appellants repeat the same
5 argument made for claim 11. We will, therefore, treat claims 12-15, 17, and
6 20-25 as standing or falling with claim 11.

7 Group III: Appellants argue claims 26-51 as a group (App. Br. 7-8).
8 For claims 27-51, Appellants repeat the same argument made for claim 26.
9 We will, therefore, treat claims 27-51 as standing or falling with claim 26.

10 Group IV: Appellants argue claim 16 separately (App. Br. 8).
11 Because claim 17 depends from claim 16, we shall group claim 17 with
12 claim 16. We will, therefore, treat claim 17 as standing or falling with claim
13 16.

14 Group V: Appellants argue claims 18 and 19 as a group (App. Br. 9).
15 For claim 19, Appellants repeat the same argument made for claim 18.
16 Because claim 20 depends from claim 19, we shall also group claim 20 with
17 claim 18. We will, therefore, treat claims 19 and 20 as standing or falling
18 with claim 18.

19 Group VI: Appellants argue claims 53-56 as a group (App. Br. 9).
20 For claims 54-56, Appellants repeat the same argument made for claim 53.
21 We will, therefore, treat claims 54-56 as standing or falling with claim 53.

22 *See 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii). See also In re Young, 927 F.2d 588,
23 590 (Fed. Cir. 1991).*

The Board's Claim Construction

"Our analysis begins with construing the claim limitations at issue."

Ex Parte Filatov, No. 2006-1160, 2007 WL 1317144, at *2 (BPAI 2007).

4 Claims are given their broadest reasonable construction “in light of
5 the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the
6 art.” *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d at 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

To determine whether Jacobson anticipates claims 1-56, we must first determine the scope of the claims. Our reviewing court stated in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2005), *cert. denied, sub nom. AWH Corp. v Phillips*, 126 S. Ct. 1332 (2006): The claims, of course, do not stand alone. Rather, they are part of “a fully integrated written instrument,” *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 978, consisting principally of a specification that concludes with the claims. For that reason, claims “must be read in view of the specification, of which they are a part.” *Id.* at 979. As stated in *Vitronics*, the specification “is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” 90 F.3d at 1582.

We note that Appellants have identified the claimed term “*portable representation language*” as a structured data representation including markup languages and object languages (FF 1). Thus, we find that this term includes any structured data format including object languages.

The Anticipation Rejection

2 "Having construed the claim limitations at issue, we now compare the
3 claims to the prior art to determine if the prior art anticipates those claims."
4 *In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.*, 301 F.3d 1343, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Claims 1-10, and 52

7 Appellants contend that “there is no disclosure or even a suggestion
8 [in Jacobson] of distinct data elements for implementing the security policy
9 on a computer.” (App. Br. 5.)

10 The Examiner found and concluded that “the data element is vague as
11 to what constitutes a ‘data element’ in the claim language, and there is no
12 language in the claim to further limit the terminology of a ‘data element’.
13 The Examiner is broadly interpreting the ‘data element’ as being just a
14 software program.” (Ans. 10-11). We agree.

15 Jacobson discloses using software to electronically monitor
16 compliance with a security policy and electronically implementing an action
17 in response to compliance issues (FF 2-4). Thus, we find that Jacobson
18 discloses at least one data element (i.e., software) for implementing the
19 security policy on computer systems.

20 Appellants further contend that “while an HTML type provision of
21 information to remote locations executing on browser is inferred in
22 Jacobson, it does not follow that the HTML would disclose or suggest the
23 ‘security policy document’ of Claim 1.” (App. Br. 6.) In addition,

1 Appellants contend that the “‘policy training module’ and other modules of
2 Jacobson are not described as creating a specific ‘security policy document’
3 that contains such HTML form information.” (App. Br. 6.)

4 The Examiner found that “the features upon which Appellant relies
5 (i.e., HTML) are not recited in the rejected claim” (Ans. 13). We agree.

6 We find that Appellants’ Claim 1 is far broader than what Appellants
7 are arguing. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “*enabling creation of a security*
8 *policy document in a portable representation language.*” As noted *supra*,
9 we found that a “portable representation language” includes any structured
10 data format including object languages. We further find that Claim 1 merely
11 requires “*enabling creation of*” not the actual creation of a security
12 document.

13 Jacobson discloses creating/generating policy training modules and
14 on-line policy manuals using user’s recommendations as benchmarks
15 whereby the generation includes using an object library (FF 5-8). Thus, we
16 find that Jacobson discloses a “security policy document” (i.e., the training
17 modules and/or the on-line policy manual) in a “portable representation
18 language” (i.e., object). Furthermore, we find that “*enabling creation of*”
19 reads on Jacobson’s gathering of user’s recommendations to use for policy
20 creation (FF 6).

21 As such, we do *not* find that Appellants have shown that Jacobson
22 lacks the above-noted disputed features of claim 1. Instead, we find the
23 Examiner has set forth a sufficient initial showing of anticipation.

1 Therefore, we affirm the rejection of independent claim 1 and of claims 2-
2 10, and 52, which fall therewith.

3

4 *Claims 11-15 and 21-25*

5 Appellants contend that there is “no discussion or suggestion of
6 enabling creation of a security policy document by enabling selection of
7 security policies from a set of options anywhere in [Jacobson].” (App. Br.

8 7.) Appellants further contend that “even if all these characterizations of
9 Jacobs[o]n were accurate, they would not suggest creation of a security
10 policy document by selecting ‘security policies from a set of options’ as
11 recited in Claim 11. Instead, it is the employee feedback, not the hypertext
12 link selections, that would be used in Jacobs[o]n.” (Reply Br. 3.)

13 The Examiner found:

14 In regards to selection of policies, it is disclosed by Jacobson that the
15 user is presented with a suggested network policy that the
16 organization wishes to implement, see column 5, lines 41-50. The
17 individual and group policy recommendation information is collected
18 and serves as a tool to dictate the creation of the security policy, see
19 column 5, lines 41-50 and column 6, lines 22-26.

20 (Ans. 16.) We agree.

21 Jacobson discloses using the user’s policy recommendations as a
22 benchmark for others to use during policy creation (FF 6). Thus, we find
23 that Jacobson discloses “*enabling selection of security policies from a set of*
24 *options*” given that Jacobson allows the user to start with previously
25 submitted recommendations as a standard/benchmark.

1 As such, we do *not* find that Appellants have shown that Jacobson
2 lacks the above-noted disputed features of claim 11. Instead, we find the
3 Examiner has set forth a sufficient initial showing of anticipation.
4 Therefore, we affirm the rejection of independent claim 11 and of claims 12-
5 15 and 21-25, which fall therewith.

6

Claims 26-51

8 Appellants contend that Jacobson “does not include an anticipatory
9 disclosure of such particular recitations of inclusion of human and machine
10 information in a security policy document to provide security policy
11 management ‘for one or more users and one or more first computers in a
12 network’ as recited in Claim 26.” (App. Br. 8.) Appellants further contend
13 that “no explanation is provided of how these alleged technical controls are
14 contained in a machine-readable security policy document created by a
15 security policy document ‘automatically configured’ to create such controls
16 in a machine-readable security policy document.” (Reply Br. 3.)

17 The Examiner found that “Jacobson disclose of presenting
18 information to the user for viewing, or in a ‘human-readable form’, see
19 column 5, lines 37-50.” (Ans. 17.) We agree.

20 We also found that Jacobson discloses providing a retraining module
21 related to the security policies to users (FF 4), which necessarily must be in a
22 human-readable format. As for the claimed “*machine-readable security*
23 *policy document containing technical controls readable by at least one first*

1 *computer,*" we find that such a limitation reads on any security policy
2 software program that controls a computer. Jacobson discloses software
3 programs that offer policy compliance assistance (FF 3), i.e., policy software
4 that controls a computer, and using software programs to electronically
5 implementing various compliance actions (FF 4). Furthermore, Jacobson
6 discloses that new policies are *automatically* added to the policy
7 effectiveness system (i.e., a machine-readable security policy document
8 containing technical controls) and the organization's policy manual (i.e., a
9 human-readable security policy document) (FF 10).

10 As such, we do *not* find that Appellants have shown that Jacobson
11 lacks the above-noted disputed features of claim 26. Instead, we find the
12 Examiner has set forth a sufficient initial showing of anticipation.
13 Therefore, we affirm the rejection of independent claim 26 and of claims 27-
14 51, which fall therewith.

Claims 16 and 17

17 Appellants contend that “there is no discussion related to distributing
18 detect rules in this excerpt [Jacobson] and Claim 16 is separately patentable
19 for at least these additional reasons.” (App. Br. 8.) Appellants further
20 contend that “even though these new sections are discussed responsive to
21 Appellants’ assertion that Jacobson does not disclose ‘distributing detect
22 rules,’ the comments referring to Column 5 of Jacobson at no point even
23 mention ‘distributing detect rules.’” (Reply Br. 4.)

1 Claim 16 recites “*further comprising distributing detect rules to at*
2 *least one first computer.*” Appellants’ Specification describes “detect rules”
3 for verifying compliance of the computer systems with security policies
4 [¶[0010]].

5 As noted *supra*, Jacobson discloses software programs that offer
6 policy compliance assistance (FF 3). Furthermore, Jacobson discloses that
7 all software is *distributed* with compliance conditions or restrictions of its
8 use (FF 9). What is significant is that the “*distributing detect rules*” step in
9 claim 16 does not positively recite any relationship to any other step. Thus,
10 we find that Jacobson discloses “*distributing detect rules*”, as set forth in
11 claim 16.

12 As such, we do *not* find that Appellants have shown that Jacobson
13 lacks the above-noted disputed features of claim 16. Instead, we find the
14 Examiner has set forth a sufficient initial showing of anticipation.
15 Therefore, we affirm the rejection of dependent claim 16 and of claim 17,
16 which falls therewith.

Claims 18-20

19 Appellants contend that “Claim 18 recites ‘distributing’ technical
20 controls to at least one first computer, which recitations are not addressed at
21 pages 18-19 of the Examiner’s Answer.” (Reply Br. 4.) Appellants further
22 contend that “implementing a different security policy does not disclose

1 distributing or converting technical controls or even, as discussed above,
2 teach technical controls.” (App. Br. 9.)

3 The Examiner found that the “technical controls is interpreted in the
4 teachings of Jacobson as being responsible for electronically monitoring
5 network user compliance with a security policy and electronically evaluating
6 policy compliance.” (Ans. 18-19.) We agree.

7 Further, we note that Appellants' Specification describes technical
8 controls as "data values or parameters in machine-readable form to
9 implement the security policy on the computer systems" (¶[0024]). Thus,
10 we find that Jacobson's electronically monitoring/evaluating of policy
11 compliance inherently includes distributing machine-readable parameters.

12 As such, we do *not* find that Appellants have shown that Jacobson
13 lacks the above-noted disputed features of claim 18. Instead, we find the
14 Examiner has set forth a sufficient initial showing of anticipation.
15 Therefore, we affirm the rejection of dependent claim 18 and of claims 19
16 and 20, which fall therewith.

Claims 53-56

19 Appellants contend that “Claims 53-56 include various recitations
20 related to particular data elements and platform control elements for
21 different operating system platforms. . . .the recitations of these claims are
22 clearly not disclosed in the excerpt from column 1 of Jacobson.” (App. Br.
23 9.)

1 The Examiner found that Appellants “arguments fail to comply with
2 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims
3 define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the
4 language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.”
5 (Ans. 19.) We agree.

6 Furthermore, we find that in addressing the rejection, Appellants only
7 broadly address the rejection by highlighting portions of the claims (*see*
8 Reply Br. 5). Appellants have not contested before us what Jacobson
9 teaches according to the Examiner’s positions. Patentability is therefore
10 urged to be based upon the same analysis set forth with respect to the
11 rejection of claims 1 and 11, which approach we have found unpersuasive.

12 As such, we find the Examiner has set forth a sufficient initial
13 showing of anticipation. Therefore, we affirm the rejection of dependent
14 claims 53-56.

VII. CONCLUSION

16 We conclude that Appellants have not shown that the Examiner erred
17 in rejecting claims 1-56.

18 Thus, claims 1-56 are not patentable.

VIII. DECISION

21 In view of the foregoing discussion, we affirm the Examiner's
22 rejection of claims 1-56.

Appeal 2007-3773
Application 09/966,006

1 No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with
2 this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R.
3 § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

4

AFFIRMED

5
6
7
8
9
10

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 rwk

21
22
23
24

25 MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
26 PO BOX 37428
27 RALEIGH NC 27627